REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 15, 35 and 40 have been amended, and claims 28-34 and 36-39 have been canceled. Claims 1-27, 35 and 40-48 are presently pending.

The specification has been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors uncovered during further review of the application.

In view of such amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as presently presented, are respectfully requested.

EXAMINER'S ACTION

The 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20, 22, 24-32, 34-38, 40-41, 43 and 45-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 99/33070 (Belli *et al.*"). In addition, claims 7, 14, 21, 23, 33, 39, 42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Belli *et al.*

Independent claims 1, 15 and 40, as amended, and claims 2-14, 16-27, 35 and 41-48 which depend directly or indirectly upon claims 1, 15 or 40, clearly are patentable over Belli *et al.*

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an electric power cable with a semiconductive conductor shield overlaying a conductor and, in relevant part, "a foamed crosslinked semiconductive insulation shield positioned over and adhered to" a cross-linked insulation layer which is formed over the conductor shield. Claim 1 further requires that the "foaming of said foamed insulation shield is obtained after extrusion of said insulation shield onto said insulation layer." As discussed in the specification, decomposition of the foaming agent contained within the insulation shield of the claimed

inventive cable does not occur during extrusion of the insulation shield over the insulation layer. Foaming of the foamed insulation layer, by decomposing of the foaming agent, occurs only after extrusion of the insulation shield. (See specification, for example, at paragraph [0031]).

In contrast to the Examiner's statements, Belli *et al.* describes that expansion of the expanded layer, *i.e.*, decomposition of the foaming (expanding) agent of the expanded layer, is "carried out during the extrusion phase." (See Belli *et al.*, page 12, lines 6-27). In particular, the description at page 16, lines 10-13 of Belli *et al.* relied upon by the Examiner concerns processing during extrusion at sufficiently high temperatures to provide for expansion of the expanding agent. (See also Belli *et al.*, page 13, lines 3-7). Nowhere does Belli *et al.* teach or suggest obtaining the foamed insulation shield by foaming, *e.g.*, decomposing the foaming agent, of the insulation shield "after extrusion" of the insulation shield onto the insulation layer, as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Belli *et al.*

In addition, amended independent method claims 15 and 40, each of which is directed to a method for producing an electrical cable and includes limitations corresponding to those of claim 1 and which require decomposing the chemical foaming agent of a semiconductive insulation material for foaming the insulation shield "after the extruding" of the conductor shield, the insulation layer and the insulation shield material, are patentable over Belli *et al.* for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Further, claims 2-14 and 35, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1,

claims 16-27, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 15, and claims 41-48, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 40, are also patentable over Belli *et al.* for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1 and because of the further restrictions they add.

Dependent claim 5 requires that the decomposing of the chemical foaming agent of the insulation shield, which occurs after the insulation shield is extruded onto the insulation, is performed at greater than atmospheric pressure. Belli *et al.* nowhere teaches or suggest such feature. The Examiner misread claim 5 to require extruding at a pressure above atmospheric pressure, instead of extruding and then decomposing (*e.g.*, by heating) at greater than atmospheric pressure. (See specification at paragraph [0034]).

Furthermore, claim 7, which depends on claim 5, should be found patentable, because nowhere does Belli *et al.* teach or suggest decomposing the foaming agent after extrusion at a pressure of at least 135 psi.

In addition, claims 18, 21 and 42, which recite that the heating and, thus, decomposing of the foaming agent, are performed at a pressure of greater than atmospheric pressure or about 135 psi, and claims 23-24 and 44-45, which recite that the heating (after extrusion) is performed at the indicated elevated temperatures, also are patentable over Belli *et al.*, because, as set forth above, there is no teaching or suggestion that decomposing of the foaming agent is performed after extruding as required by these claims.

Withdrawal of the Section 102 and 103 rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims, as presently presented, are patentable.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is believed that further amendment and/or discussion would help to advance the prosecution of the present application.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-27, 35 and 40-48 are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Davy E. Zoneraich
Registration Number 37,267

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
P.O. Box 1018
Somerville, New Jersey 08876-1018
Phone: (908) 722-0700
Fax: (908) 722-0755
E-Mail: ipdept@nmmlaw.com

Attorney Docket No: 105137-029US